



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,501	01/26/2005	Jurgen Flach	4952-107 US	7571
26817	7590	08/04/2009	EXAMINER	
MATHEWS, SHEPHERD, MCKAY, & BRUNEAU, P.A.			KELLER, MICHAEL J	
29 THANET ROAD, SUITE 201				
PRINCETON, NJ 08540			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/522,501	FLACH, JURGEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael J. Keller	3634

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J. Keller. (3) Diane Dunn McKay.
 (2) Michael Safavi. (4) Jurgen Flach.

Date of Interview: 29 July 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 33 and 36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Carbonara (US,2,968,790); Thompson (US,5,978,483).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Flach had discussed what he perceived to be differences between Applicant's invention and the applied prior art references focusing on how the claimed "code setting device" can be programmed and changed, (see attached draft amendment). Examiner suggested including more structural language in the claims to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art, as opposed to focusing on the desired function and intended use of the invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael Safavi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637	
---	--